United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,221	10/17/2005	Tetsuya Yano	03500.018109	9077	
SS14 FITZDATDICI	7590 11/28/2007		EXAMINER		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			LILLING, HERBERT J		
NEW YORK,	NY 10112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	•		1657		
				2011/2011/1000	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	The second secon
	10/553,221	YANO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HERBERT J. LILLING	1657	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2005 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☑ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this Nationa	l Stage
Attachment(s)	A) 🔲 latas issu 0	(DTO 412)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/553,221

Art Unit: 1657

1. Receipt is acknowledged of two prior art information disclosure statements file October 17, 2005 and November 30, 2006.

Page 2

- 2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application for this Application which is a 371 of PCT/JP04/06296 filed April 30, 2004 which claims benefit to JP 2003-127503 filed May 02, 2003.
- 3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-6 and 20, drawn to a structure containing polyhydroxyalkanoate and a magnetic substance, comprising: an external phase part containing the polyhydroxyalkanoate; and an internal phase part contained in the external phase part, at least one of the external phase part and the internal phase part containing the magnetic substance.

Group II, claim(s) 7-19, drawn to a manufacturing method for a structure having an external phase part containing polyhydroxyalkanoate and an internal phase part contained in the external phase part with at least one of the external phase part and the internal phase part containing a magnetic substance, comprising the steps of: preparing a liquid raw material including an oil phase containing polyhydroxyalkanoate and an organic solvent, a water phase, and the magnetic substance; and removing at least one of the organic solvent and the water from the liquid raw material, the inner phase part being contained in the external phase part including PHA derived from the oil phase or the water phase, and at least one of the external phase part and the internal phase part containing the magnetic substance.

Because these inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 as evidenced by the PCT search report that clearly anticipates the claimed inventions as noted by references WO97/43005 and/or EP 1,275378 which search report indicates lack of novelty as well as lack of inventive step.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above drawn to a structure that requires a search and examination in class 428 and whereas the method claims requires a search and examination in Class 427 to prepare the structure which would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. In addition, the search and examination for the two groups involve different computerized strategies, which searches will not be totally overlapping that would be extremely burdensome.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 1657

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 6. In accordance with this Tech Center Policy based on above restriction containing product claims and process claims, this Examiner will rejoin any non-elected process claims upon the election of a product claim which is subsequently is found allowable in view of the following guidelines:

F.P.: Ochiai/Brouwer Rejoinder form paragraph

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP §

Art Unit: 1657

821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,221 Page 6

Art Unit: 1657

7. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lilling whose telephone number is 571-272-0918 and Fax Number is 571-273-8300. or SPE Jon Weber whose telephone number is 571-272-0925. Examiner can be reached Monday-Friday from about 7:30 A.M. to about 7:00 P.M. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 308-0196.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

H.J.Lilling: HJL (571) 272-0918 Art Unit **1657** November 20, 2007

> Dr. Herbert J. Lilling Primary Examiner

Group 1600 Art Unit 1657